



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
MAY 18, 2006
APPROVED**

PRESENT: Robert Littlefield, Chairman
Jeremy Jones, Vice Chairman
Eric Hess, Commissioner
E.L. Cortez, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Randy Grant
Don Hadder
Tim Curtis
Dan Symer
Mac Cummins
Kira Wauwie
Donna Bronski

CALL TO ORDER

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Littlefield at 1:04 p.m.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilman Littlefield read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted in which members were present as stated above.

MINUTES APPROVAL

1. May 4, 2006 Development Review Board Study Session Minutes
2. May 4, 2006 Development Review Board Regular Meeting Minutes

APPROVED 6/1/06-DRB

3. May 4, 2006 Development Review Board Retreat Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE MAY 4, 2006 MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR SESSION, STUDY SESSION, AND RETREAT. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

ADMINISTRATIVE

4. Approval of Development Review Board 2006 Calendar

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE 2006 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD CALENDAR. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

- | | | |
|-----|--------------|---|
| 5. | 50-DR-2003#2 | <u>Desert Hills Presbyterian Church</u> |
| 6. | 3-PP-2004#2 | <u>Sienna Hills</u> |
| 7. | 45-DR-2005#2 | <u>Riverwalk Condominiums - Phase 2</u> |
| 10. | 4-DR-2006 | <u>Woodmere Condominiums</u> |
| 12. | 20-DR-2006 | <u>Alt. Concealment WCF - P717 Pump Station</u> |
| 13. | 31-DR-2006 | <u>Scottsdale Wifi</u> |

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT ITEMS 50-DR-2003#2, 3-PP-2004#2, 45-DR-2005#2, 4-DR-2006, 20-DR-2006, AND 31-DR-2006 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

8. 83-DR-2005 Orange Row Condominiums

Mr. Cummins reviewed the case, noting that the Applicant requested a discussion regarding one of the proposed staff stipulations.

Mr. Rob Paulus addressed the Board. He reviewed a brief history of the site, explaining issues relating to the narrowness of the lot which necessitated the zero lot line. Presenting elevations and a section view, he argued that DRB stipulation #22 would not be necessary, due to the durability of the materials being used. In response to a question by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. Paulus clarified that the builder has assured him of this..

Roland Sorentino, the developer, stated that the neighbor is not interested in cooperating with a temporary easement or a future maintenance agreement. Vice-Chairman Jones opined that due to the materials being used for the case a maintenance easement may not be required; he surveyed staff concerning setting precedent.

Mr. Grant mentioned a past experience where there was a problem with a neighbor not allowing utilization of their property for maintenance, explaining that situation caused staff to reconsider their approach with zero lot lines. He agreed that in this case the materials may not necessitate maintenance, noting staff needed to be certain that the long term impacts are anticipated.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea regarding the doors facing the zero lot line and the potential for the neighbor to build up to the zero lot line rendering the doors impassable, Mr. Paulus clarified that access was not required by ordinance; the doors were to be used for access to the planting.

Board Member Cortez agreed that the materials would alleviate much of the maintenance. He commented that in order to supply the Arizona room with foliage the neighbor's property would need to be accessed; he inquired whether the neighboring owner was aware of the sequence of events to take place during construction. Mr. Sorentino explained that the entrance to the Arizona Room is recessed approximately five feet which would allow for the landscaping. Mr. Sorentino commented that he neighbor had no interest in anyone being on his property at any time unless he was there.

In response to a comment by Board Member Cortez, Mr. Sorentino reiterated that although it would be more difficult and would increase cost, the builder had assured him the building could be constructed without infringing on the neighboring property.

Board Member D'Andrea opined that the footing would not be able to be made without hitting the neighboring property whether it was hand dug or equipment was used. He inquired whether the design could be changed to pull the wall in at least a foot. Board Member Cortez commented that structural engineering had advanced to a degree that would accommodate the design using an asymmetrically loaded footer; the challenge would be the additional cost for the structural design. Board Member Cortez advised the Applicant to assure the neighbor that although they may encroach on his property during construction, it would be surveyed and staked.

Board Member O'Neill stated that there was no mention of what the required distance would be for the private maintenance easement. Mr. Grant clarified that if this were a residential plat with a zero lot line there would be a five-foot easement. In response to a suggestion by Board Member O'Neill that one solution could be to reduce the front setback, Mr. Grant argued that staff would prefer to get the easement because that would cause cars to hang over into the street. Board Member O'Neill stated that he would support removing the stipulation requiring the maintenance agreement.

Vice-Chairman Jones opined that the need for maintenance would be minimal. He commented that the Applicant had followed all recommendations and he would prefer to see it advance without the stipulation.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 83-DR-2005 WITH THE REMOVAL OF STIPULATION 22. BOARD MEMBER HESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member D'Andrea suggested trying to get some sort of agreement with the neighbor to obtain access to the property during construction, even if an incentive needed to be offered.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

9. 114-DR-2005 Granite Reef Circle Lofts

Mr. Cummins reviewed the request for a multifamily residential structure. The one issue staff wanted to draw the Boards attention to was that the Applicant received approval from the Board of Adjustment to encroach into a setback along Granite Reef Road; the current design meets all provisions of the City zoning ordinance with the variance.

Mr. Andre Hicken addressed the Board. He presented a 3D PowerPoint model of the project and reviewed refinements which had been made to the project that made the overall focus clearer.

In response to a comment by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. Hicken confirmed that in addition to the refinements he mentioned, the block walls were extended out so that the block wall would extend past the pop-outs.

A discussion ensued between Board Member D'Andrea and Mr. Hicken concerning the screen wall and parapets on the roof surrounding the units. Board Member D'Andrea suggested if the parapets were taller there would be no need for the screening.

Mr. Hicken confirmed that access approval had been received from the Fire Department; full access inside and outside the radius of the building is available.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. Hicken explained that there was no access to the lawn area from the wedge units because the first floor consisted of the garage; private open space per unit is accomplished by providing a large private deck with a view of the center area. The square units each have a ten foot back yard, because they have living space on the bottom floor. Board Member Schmitt commented that it would be beneficial to residents to make use of the open space surrounding the perimeter of the circular element.

Board Member D'Andrea commented that all though the colors worked together, he was afraid the color F-1 would look muddy once put on the wall. He suggested that a lighter shade in the same color family be used.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE GRANITE REEF CIRCLE LOFTS, 114-DR-2005, AS MODIFIED DURING THE PRESENTATION.

Board Member D'Andrea clarified that modifications were to include the outer ring side of parapet walls which were to be extended higher to cover the mechanical units and that the new color replacing F-1 be brought back to a study session for review.

SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER HESS, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

11. 16-DR-2006 Audio Express

Mr. Curtis addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial view of the site and shopping center and site elevations.

Vice-Chairman Jones commented that more was happening on the building than on surrounding buildings. He mentioned the stucco masses covering parts of the block wall and inquired whether there was a way to simplify the building.

Ruben Armado, representing K&I Architects, inquired whether the stucco masses were the only issue. Vice-Chairman Jones clarified that he did not want to redesign the building; he suggested simplifying either the color or material in order to be more in keeping with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Armado clarified that the designer used the same color palette that was used throughout the shopping center; the designer wanted detail to enhance the simple rectangular shapes.

Board Member O'Neill commented that the illustration did not do the design justice; the Board should not redesign the building. He opined that the elevations were well done and the building would be fine in the shopping center setting.

Board Member D'Andrea inquired about screening surrounding the installation area. Mr. Armado showed the location of the screening on the drawing. He clarified that all installations would be done indoors and the screening concealed the entrance and exit for that area.

Board Member Cortez concurred that the project was overdone. He opined that the outer edges of the building appeared to have been outlined with a dark component with the interior surfaces filled in. He suggested replacing the red masonry unit surrounding the window with a larger window, eliminating all vertical outline elements, and re-evaluating and simplifying the composition. He opined that a better product would result from using the "less is more" philosophy.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member Schmitt regarding the number of signs depicted on the building, Mr. Grant clarified that the Development Review Board approved the building and the sign would be permitted separately; he noted that the City would not allow the signs as they were depicted.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 16-DR-2006, AUDIO EXPRESS, FOR THE SPECIFIC REASON OF SIMPLIFYING THE ELEVATIONS OF THE BUILDING.

Vice-Chairman Jones advised the Applicant that there were no objections to the site plan or the general arrangement or size. He noted that with a little work they would get the project approved.

BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Hess suggested a specific date be set for a reasonable amount of time. Mr. Grant suggested 45 days in order to get the project approved before summer recess.

Board Member O'Neill suggested the Applicant attempt to articulate a stipulation in order to get approval without the continuance. Councilman Littlefield opined that the objections were too broad for a stipulation.

Vice-Chairman Jones suggested that the designer eliminate a color and some of the stucco pop-outs that were applied over the block. He noted that the changes would save money and simplify the composition in order to blend with the rest of the shopping center. He requested that when the Applicant returned they show fewer signs on the illustrations.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

Councilman Littlefield reiterated that the case was continued for no more than 45 days.

14. 89-DR-2004#3 Perimeter Center Parkview Bldgs 3 & 4

Mr. Curtis addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial photo of the site, elevations, and the landscape plan. He displayed the two buildings which were already approved and the way in which buildings three and four would work within the area; the fifth building would be submitted at a future date. Mr. Curtis noted that Vice-Chairman Jones made a comment during the study session pertaining to the roof element at the corner of the buildings which was addressed by the Applicant with an alternative design.

Board Member Cortez noted his support of the solution the Applicant presented.

Board Member D'Andrea inquired about connectivity, noting no covered walkways were depicted. He was more specifically concerned about landscaping and the large expanses of space. He inquired whether code was being met and whether anything could be done to break up the longer isles. Mr. Clay Ciappini of Butler Design stated that concrete planters had been incorporated at the end of the parking rows. He explained that planters needed to be placed on top of structural columns because of areas that were already occupied underground. Board Member D'Andrea opined that if possible the experience of the pedestrian

would be better served if the large expanse of paving were better shaded with trees.

Mr. Ciappini stated that the pedestrian link was at the northern end of building one on the drive that swings through which will be connected to the parking lot. Board Member D'Andrea opined that people would not utilize the walkway; they would walk directly through the parking lot to the front door.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE PERIMETER CENTER, 89- DR-2004#3 WITH THE ALTERNATE CORNER ROOF DESIGN. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, Councilman Littlefield moved for adjournment at 2:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc